



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,529	04/20/2001	Andrew Hausman	3524/33	2141
29858	7590	08/10/2006	EXAMINER	
BROWN, RAYSMAN, MILLSTEIN, FELDER & STEINER LLP			OYEBISI, OJO O	
900 THIRD AVENUE			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10022			PAPER NUMBER	
			3628	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,529

Applicant(s)

HAUSMAN, ANDREW

Examiner

OJO O. OYEBISI

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-50 are currently pending and claims 1-50 stand rejected in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalmus et al. (Kalmus hereinafter, US PAT: 4,674,044).

Re claim 1. Kalmus discloses a method for electronic trading of interests with a reserve over at least one network including computers, comprising: receiving terms for a total desired trade of interests (i.e., orders has to include appropriate data fields, such as identification of the office and customer, stock identification, price particulars and so forth, and then qualifies the order, see col.5, lines 1-10), said terms comprising an identification of said interests (i.e., stock/orders/shares/securities, see col.5, lines 1-10), an initial price (i.e., current bid and asked prices, see col.5, lines 1-10), an initial quantity (i.e., the amount of stock available for customer purchase or sale, see abstract) and a reserve quantity (i.e., orders not executable, i.e., orders not qualified, are either stored in memory for later execution if they become qualified, see col.5, lines 15-20); associating with said desired trade a reserve price change (i.e., a favorable change in the market price for a security, see col.5, lines 19-22); disclosing terms of a first

Art Unit: 3628

proposed trade of said interest to others via the at least one network (i.e., first determines whether or not each received order can be executed i.e., qualifies the order, see col.5, lines 5-10) said terms for a first proposed trade comprising an identification of said interests (i.e., stock/orders/shares/securities, see col.5, lines 1-10), said initial price (current bid and asked prices, see col.5 lines 1-10) and said initial quantity(i.e., the amount of stock available for customer purchase or sale, see abstract); and upon acceptance of said first proposed trade (i.e., order execution, see col.5, lines 22-25), disclosing terms of a second proposed trade of said interest to others via the at least one network (i.e., determines whether or not each received order can be executed i.e., qualifies the order, see col.5, lines 5-10), said terms for a second proposed trade comprising an identification of said interests (i.e., stock/orders/shares/securities, see col.5, lines 1-10). Kalmus does not explicitly disclose the limitations " a second price, and a second quantity, said second price being equal to said initial price changed by said reserve price change, and said second quantity comprising at least a portion of said reserve quantity." However, Kalmus does suggest that when the insider market price changes, the processor signals the trader who in turn readjusts his quantity or other market-characterizing criteria, and following each price change, all non-executable orders stored in memory are reviewed to determine whether they have become executable (see col.5, line31-45). Thus, when the price changes and the quantity is readjusted, it is obvious that there will be a new price (i.e., second price, third price, fourth price etc) and a new quantity (i.e., second quantity, third quantity, fourth quantity etc), and said second quantity would comprise at least a portion of said reserve quantity

Art Unit: 3628

(i.e., every order (first, second, third etc) would be taken from non executable orders (reserve quantity) until all orders become executable).

Re claims 2-7. Kalmus discloses the method, wherein said interests comprise interests in commodities contracts, energy forward contracts, equity securities, fixed income securities, currency, a first currency and said initial price and said second price are expressed in a second currency (i.e., stock/orders/shares/securities see col.5, lines 1-10, also see abstract).

Re claim 8. Kalmus further discloses the method, wherein all terms of said second proposed trade are automatically disclosed (i.e., operative best bid and best asked prices for each stock are communicated over link 22 from NASDAQ....., and orders for trades in the relevant securities are funneled to the processor in real time, see col.4, lines 52-60).

Re claim 9. Kalmus further discloses the method as stated supra, wherein all terms of said second proposed trade are disclosed only after some intervention by an appropriate system user (i.e., the processor signals the trader to readjust his quantity or other market-characterizing criteria, see col.5, lines 35-40).

Re claims 10 and 11. Kalmus further discloses the method as stated supra, wherein said proposed trades are proposed sales, and said reserve price change increases said initial price, and said proposed trades are proposed purchases, and said reserve price change decreases said initial price (i.e., Thus, for example, the customer may seek to sell stock above the current bid price or to purchase the security below the current asked price. A customer may seek to trade a number of shares which exceeds

Art Unit: 3628

the amount which the particular market maker is willing to accommodate, either in gross or for any one order. Orders not executable, i.e., orders not qualified, are either stored in memory in the processor 10 for later execution if they become qualified (such as by a favorable change in the market price for a security which can then accommodate the customer's price limits, col.5 lines 5-20. That is to say, the bid prices and the asked prices are readjusted when the orders become qualified depending on if the orders are sale orders or purchase orders, later execution of proposed sales would sell at higher prices than the initial price, and later execution of proposed purchases would purchase at lower prices than the initial prices).

Re claim 12. Kalmus further discloses the method, wherein said second quantity is equal to a preselected quantity, or if said reserve quantity is less than the preselected quantity, all of said reserve quantity (i.e., when the insider market price changes, the processor signals the trader who in turn readjusts his quantity or other market-characterizing criteria, and following each price change, all non-executable orders stored in memory are reviewed to determine whether they have become executable (see col.5, line31-45), that is to say, when the price changes and the quantity is readjusted, it is obvious that there will be a new price (i.e., second price) and a new quantity (i.e., second quantity), and said second quantity would comprise at least a portion of said reserve quantity (i.e., every order (first, second, third etc) would be taken from non executable orders (reserve quantity) until all orders become executable – note if preselected quantity > reserve quantity, then all orders have been executed, reserve=0).

Art Unit: 3628

Re claim 13. Kalmus does not explicitly disclose the method, further comprising: upon acceptance of said second proposed trade, disclosing terms of a third proposed trade of said interest to others via the at least one network, said terms for a third proposed trade comprising an identification of said interests, a third price, and a third quantity, said third price equal to said second price changed by said reserve price change, and said third quantity being not greater than said reserve quantity less said second quantity.

However, Kalmus does implicitly teach this limitations "when the insider market price changes, the processor signals the trader who in turn readjusts his quantity or other market-characterizing criteria, and following each price change, all non-executable orders stored in memory are reviewed to determine whether they have become executable" (see col.5, line31-45). Thus, when the price changes and the quantity is readjusted, it is obvious that there will be a new price (i.e., second price, third price, fourth price etc) and a new quantity (i.e., second quantity, third quantity, fourth quantity etc), and said third quantity would comprise at least a portion of said reserve quantity (i.e., every order (first, second, third etc) would be taken from non executable orders (reserve quantity) until all orders become executable - note if preselected quantity > reserve quantity, then all orders have been executed, reserve=0, thus reserve quantity has to be \geq preselected quantity).

Re claim 14. Kalmus further implicitly disclose the method, wherein said third remaining quantity is equal to a preselected quantity, or if the quantity of reserve remaining less said first and second quantities, all remaining reserve (i.e., "when the insider market price changes, the processor signals the trader who in turn readjusts his quantity or

other market-characterizing criteria, and following each price change, all non-executable orders stored in memory are reviewed to determine whether they have become executable" (see col.5, line31-45). Thus, when the price changes and the quantity is readjusted, it is obvious that there will be a new price (i.e., second price, third price, fourth price etc) and a new quantity (i.e., second quantity, third quantity, fourth quantity etc), and said third quantity would comprise at least a portion of said reserve quantity (i.e., every order (first, second, third etc) would be taken from non executable orders (reserve quantity) until all orders become executable - note if preselected quantity > reserve quantity, then all orders have been executed, reserve=0, thus reserve quantity has to be \geq preselected quantity).

Re claim 15. Kalmus further discloses the method, further comprising completing at least one of said trades (i.e., order execution, see col.5 lines 5-45).

Re claim 16. Claim 16 recites similar limitations to claim 1, and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 1.

Re claim 17. Kalmus further discloses the method, wherein said condition is acceptance of a portion of an order for which the quantity and price are disclosed (i.e., when the insider market price changes, the processor signals the trader who in turn readjusts his quantity or other market-characterizing criteria, and following each price change, all non-executable orders stored in memory are reviewed to determine whether they have become executable (see col.5, line31-45))

Re claim 18. Claim 18 recites similar limitations to claim 1 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 1.

Art Unit: 3628

Re claims 19-22. Kalmus discloses the product, wherein said interests comprise interests in commodities contracts, energy forward contracts, in equity securities, fixed income securities (i.e., stock/orders/shares/securities see col.5, lines 1-10, also see abstract).

Re claim 23. Claim 23 recites similar limitations to claim 8 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 8.

Re claim 24. Claim 24 recites similar limitations to claim 9 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 9.

Re claims 25 and 26. Kalmus further discloses the method as stated supra, wherein said proposed trades are proposed sales, and said reserve price change increases said initial price, and said proposed trades are proposed purchases, and said reserve price change decreases said initial price (i.e., Thus, for example, the customer may seek to sell stock above the current bid price or to purchase the security below the current asked price. A customer may seek to trade a number of shares which exceeds the amount which the particular market maker is willing to accommodate, either in gross or for any one order. Orders not executable, i.e., orders not qualified, are either stored in memory in the processor 10 for later execution if they become qualified (such as by a favorable change in the market price for a security which can then accommodate the customer's price limits, col.5 lines 5-20. That is to say, the bid prices and the asked prices are readjusted when the orders become qualified depending on if the orders are sale orders or purchase orders, later execution of proposed sales would

Art Unit: 3628

sell at higher prices than the initial price, and later execution of proposed purchases would purchase at lower prices than the initial prices).

Re claim 27. Claim 27 recites similar limitations to claim 12 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 12.

Re claim 28. Claim 28 recites similar limitations to claim 13 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 13.

Re claim 29. Claim 29 recites similar limitations to claim 14 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 14.

Re claim 30. Claim 30 recites similar limitations to claim 15 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 15.

Re claims 31 and 32. Kalmus further discloses the product, wherein said interests comprise currency, and said interests comprise a first currency and said initial price and said second price are expressed in a second currency ((i.e., stock/orders/shares/securities see col.5, lines 1-10, also see abstract).

Re claims 33 and 34. Claims 33 and 34 recite similar limitations to claim 1 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 1.

Re claim 35. Claim 35 recites similar limitations to claim 8 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 8.

Re claim 36. Claim 36 recites similar limitations to claim 9 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 9.

Re claim 37. Claim 37 recites similar limitations to claim 13 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 13.

Art Unit: 3628

Re claim 38. Claim 38 recites similar limitations to claim 14 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 14.

Re claim 39. Claim 39 recites similar limitations to claim 1 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 1.

Re claim 40. Claim 40 recites similar limitations to claim 17 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 17.

Re claim 41. Claim 41 recites similar limitations to claim 1 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 1.

Re claim 42. Kalmus further discloses the method, comprising also automatically disclosing said quantity from reserve and said price therefor (i.e., operative best bid and best asked prices for each stock are communicated over link 22 from NASDAQ....., and orders for trades in the relevant securities are funneled to the processor in real time, see col.4, lines 52-60).

Re claim 43. Kalmus further discloses the method, comprising disclosing said quantity from reserve and said price therefor in response to a prompt (i.e., **the processor signals the trader** who in turn readjusts his quantity or other market-characterizing criteria, and following each price change, all non-executable orders stored in memory are reviewed to determine whether they have become executable (see col.5, line31-45).

Re claims 44 and 45. Kalmus further discloses the method, wherein said reserve price change is associated with said order in response to a prompt (i.e., when the insider market price changes, **the processor signals** the trader who in turn readjusts his quantity or other market-characterizing criteria, and following each price change, all

Art Unit: 3628

non-executable orders stored in memory are reviewed to determine whether they have become executable (see col.5, line31-45)).

Re claim 46. Claim 46 recites similar limitations to claim 1, and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 1.

Re claim 47. Claim 47 recites similar limitations to claim 42, and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 42.

Re claim 48. Claim 48 recites similar limitations to claim 43, and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 43.

Re claims 49 and 50. Kalmus further discloses the method, wherein said reserve price change is associated with said order in response to a prompt (i.e., when the insider market price changes, **the processor signals** the trader who in turn readjusts his quantity or other market-characterizing criteria, and following each price change, all non-executable orders stored in memory are reviewed to determine whether they have become executable (see col.5, line31-45)).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 05/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues in substance that, the primary reference of record, Kalmus fails to disclose a reserve quantity as claimed in claim 1. First, applicant's disclosure discusses reserve in the following context: "A trader of interests such as stocks, bonds, commodities or commodities contracts may want to buy or sell such

Art Unit: 3628

interests without immediately revealing in the relevant market the full extent of his or her intentions. For example, the disclosure to the market of the entire size of a purchase or sale order or quotation could affect the market by skewing the price. In such instances, traders may want to disclose only a portion of the full size of their intended trade to the market, and to withhold disclosing to the market the remaining portion of the intended trade (such withheld portion being known as a "reserve") until such time as the disclosed portion of the order or quotation has been executed. (Page 1, lines 17-25). The primary reference of record, **Kalmus**, discusses Reserve in the following context: "Orders not executable, i.e., orders not qualified, are either stored in memory in the processor 10 for later execution if they become qualified (such as by a favorable change in the market price for a security which can then accommodate the customer's price limits) or are forwarded to other market makers for potential execution. . ." (Co1. 5, lines 15-22). Kalmus further discloses that "here are various reasons why an order will not be executed by the market maker. Thus, for example, the customer may seek to sell stock above the current bid price or to purchase the security below the current asked price. A customer may seek to trade a number of shares which exceeds the amount which the particular market maker is willing to accommodate, either in gross or for any one order. Such Orders are not executed, and are stored in memory and later executed when there is a favorable change in the market price for a security which can then accommodate the customer's price limits." Thus, the "Orders not executable" or the "orders not qualified" as mentioned by Kalmus hereinabove is tantamount to the reserve quantity as claimed by the applicant since these non-executable orders are

kept in the reserve until there is a favorable change in the market price for a security which can then accommodate the customer's price limits.

The applicant further argues in substance that Kalmus fails to disclose a "total desired trade of interests" the terms of which comprise "an initial quantity, and a reserve quantity, " as claimed in claim 1. Contrary to the applicant's assertion, what is claimed in claim 1 is a "method for electronic trading of interests.....comprising: receiving terms for a total desired trade of interests, said terms comprising an identification of said interests an initial price, an initial quantity and a reserve quantity. Kalmus explicitly makes this disclosure as it is elucidated in the rejection of claim 1 *supra* (please see claim 1 rejection above).

Conclusion


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OJO O. OYEBISI whose telephone number is (571) 272-8298. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30A.M-5:30P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, HYUNG S. SOUGH can be reached on (571)272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


HYUNG SOUGH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600